

Date: Fri, 17 Sep 93 04:30:16 PDT  
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: Bulk  
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #338  
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest                      Fri, 17 Sep 93                      Volume 93 : Issue    338

Today's Topics:

                    A real use for CW  
            Neighborhood watch groups (2 msgs)  
            No Frills License Application  
            Restrictions on antenna hght

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

-----

Date: Fri, 17 Sep 1993 00:43:06 GMT  
From: spsgate!mogate!newsgate!nuntius@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: A real use for CW  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <y2Vy0B1w165w@amanda.jpunix.com> robert,  
robert@amanda.jpunix.com writes:  
>Sounds to me like you should have taken a more CW-literate hunting buddy  
>with you.

Well I guess you could say I hunt with the scum of the earth....Fancy  
that, he can't copy the most modern form of communication know to man.  
He is the worst kind of Riff Raff in the world.....I will be looking for  
a better hunting buddy next year.....NOT!

-----

Date: Tue, 14 Sep 93 20:19:24 CDT  
From: swrinde!menudo.uh.edu!jpunix!unkaphaed!amanda!robert@network.ucsd.edu

Subject: Neighborhood watch groups  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

mcduffie@unlinfo2.unl.edu (Gary McDuffie Sr) writes:

```
> robert@amanda.jpunix.com (robert) writes:
>
> >randy@cyphyn.UUCP (Randy) writes:
>
> >>
> >> However....the real reliable range of those sets ( vhf or uhf) is quite
> >> limited, unless thru a repeater, and very few repeater groups will want a
> >> nite after nite net on for the duration of time such watch groups would ne
> >> So be ready for that. ok?
>
> >Or...establish your OWN repeater.
>
> > --Robert
>
>
> Yeah! Then the crooks will have a central place to gather information!
>
> Gary
```

They already have police scanners, so what's the difference?

--Robert

-----  
Date: 15 Sep 1993 15:04:28 GMT  
From: drt@athena.mit.edu  
Subject: Neighborhood watch groups  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <274mfi\$2k0@crcnis1.unl.edu> mcduffie@unlinfo2.unl.edu (Gary McDuffie Sr) writes:

>Or...establish your OWN repeater.

> --Robert

Yeah! Then the crooks will have a central place to gather information!

Gary

And I thought the whole point of a neighborhood watch was to make

quite sure the crooks know what's going on ... and keep out!

-drt

--

-----  
David R. Tucker           KG2S           drt@athena.mit.edu

|'Most political sermons teach the congregation nothing except       |  
what newspapers are taken at the Rectory.' -C.S. Lewis

-----  
Date: Wed, 15 Sep 93 04:06:17 CDT  
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!usc!cs.utexas.edu!swrinde!  
menudo.uh.edu!jpunix!unkaphaed!amanda!robert@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: No Frills License Application  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

jbromley@sedona.intel.com (Jim Bromley, W5GYJ) writes:

> Awwhh, Negatorry, Good Buddy. It was actually modeled  
> after what happened in broadcasting when the owners  
> (and their NAB) convinced the FCC to make the \*station\*  
> licensee the sole point of responsibility for all  
> aspects of station operation.  
>  
> Jim, W5GYJ

Quite true. There are (or were) no Operator Licenses for Citizen's Band,  
however those are still required for Broadcast (i.e. Restricted  
Radiotelephone Operator's Certificate). Granted, that's certainly not a  
demonstration of skill.

--Robert

-----  
Date: Wed, 15 Sep 1993 18:39:27 GMT  
From: swrinde!elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!agate!linus!  
linus.mitre.org!wralston.mitre.org!user@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: Restrictions on antenna hght  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <steveWCDEIMC.Dp@netcom.com>, steveW@netcom.com (Steven Wilson)  
wrote:

>

> In article <1993Sep14.150323.22167@bsu-ucs>, 00hmhammer@leo.bsuvc.bsu.edu writes:

> > Delaware County in Indiana has a restriction (Countywide) limiting  
> > antenna height to 75 feet, unless the builder seeks a license.

> >

> > What is the current law on this type of restriction?

> >

> > What are the steps suggested by conventional wisdom in challenging  
> > this type of restriction?

> >

> > Any experience out there?

> >

> > Howard Hammer

> > 00hmhammer@bsu.edu

>

> What are you guys gripping about! 75 feet...geesh...In most places

> around here with ordinances...they come in at between 35-65 feet.

> Consider yourself fortunate.

>

I wish we had an antenna height restriction in my town - the building inspector (at the time I asked) would have realized that antennas are allowed. Since there is no mention of antenna height limits in the bylaws, he chose to interpret the zoning bylaws as not allowing antennas, and told me my permit would be denied. (He was subsequently found to be taking bribes, so I suspect he really just wanted me to discuss the "fee" I was willing to pay for a permit...)

-- Bill wtr@mitre.org

\* I babble too incoherently to speak for my employer \*

-----

Date: Thu, 16 Sep 1993 21:14:44 GMT

From: galaxy.ucr.edu!library.ucla.edu!agate!spool.mu.edu!darwin.sura.net!

rsg1.er.usgs.gov!dgg.cr.usgs.gov!bodoh@network.ucsd.edu

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <6373@catnip.berkeley.ca.us>,

<1993Sep15.205224.22902@peavax.mlo.dec.com>,

<1993Sep16.183129.20227@Csl.Stanford.EDU>

Subject : Re: Codeless Technician

In article <1993Sep16.183129.20227@Csl.Stanford.EDU>, paulf@Csl.Stanford.EDU (Paul Flaherty) writes:

|> mcleman@zso.dec.com (Jeff McLeman) writes:

|>

|> [Incestuous Drive1 Deleted for Decorum]

```
|>
|> Well, I see that the Code Wars have descended to a new low...
|>
|> --
|> -=Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "The National Anthem has become The Whine."
|> ->paulf@Stanford.EDU | -- Charles Sykes, _A Nation of Victims_
```

Yes, it is starting to resemble alt.tv.barney (which is for non-fans)...

```
--
+++++
+ Tom Bodoh - Sr. systems software engineer, Hughes STX, N0YGT +
+ USGS/EROS Data Center, Sioux Falls, SD, USA 57198 (605) 594-6830 +
+ Internet; bodoh@dggs.cr.usgs.gov (152.61.192.66)
+
+ "Welcome back my friends to the show that never ends!" EL&P
+
+++++
```

-----

Date: Wed, 15 Sep 1993 09:27:17 -0700  
From: ftpbox!mothost!schbbs!node\_142cf.aieg.mot.com!user@uunet.uu.net  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <2244@arrrl.org>, <1993Sep15.012310.11530@mixcom.mixcom.com>,  
<CDDuH5.L1K@news.Hawaii.Edu>com  
Subject : Re: Codeless Technician

In article <CDDuH5.L1K@news.Hawaii.Edu>, jherman@uhunix3.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu  
(Jeff Herman) wrote:

```
> >
> >Kevin Jessup, N9SQB "A bad day of DXing is better than a good day at work."
>
> Kevin, given your stance against learning the code, your signature doesn't
> really make sense; how would you know anything about DXing? You've stated
> you're a no-coder, so you've never operated on the low bands. Are you working
> DX on VHF?
```

As a DXer myself I think the most challenging DX is indedd on VHF.

```
> I am wondering why so many anti-code folks came into this hobby, only
> to complain about having to learn the code; they knew in advance they
> would have to know the code to receive the HF privileges. Very puzzling.
```

Don't confuse wanting a no code license with being "anti code" in any

sense!

I fully support the no code license and enjoy CW very much, I even have over 200 CW countries confirmed.

The real question that Kevin was asking is "what skills can be tested for to give a good Amateur Radio operator". His point (and I agree) is that reliance on Morse code proficiency is the wrong thing to do. I don't think that implies a "no test" license, only that we look carefully for alternatives.

CW does teach a lot of good things about radio, so do learning phonetic alphabets, marine/aircraft radio procedures, meteor scatter propagation, and dozens of other things. I don't have any good answers, but I think we had all better start thinking about alternatives lest Amateur radio be the only radio service still exclusively requiring CW proficiency (maybe it is already?).

Allowing Amateur radio to become fixated on any one skill will ensure the demise of Amateur Radio just as surely as a "no test" license.

> Jeff NH6IL (with 3rd degree burns from many of my previous posts...)

If you keep misrepresenting others posts you deserve it!

--

Mike Waters rcrw90@email.mot.com AA4MW@KC7Y.PHX.AZ.US.NA

-----

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #338

\*\*\*\*\*